IN THEUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

MICHAELJN ABOURS.

Petitioner.

v. Civ. 12-426RB/GBW

CHRISTOPHER BARELA,

Respondent.

OR DER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGES PROPOSED FIN DINGS AN DRECOMMEN DED DISPOSITIONS

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus $D\alpha$. 1. On August 16, 2012, the Magistrate Julge issued his first Proposed Finding sand Recommended Disposition (PFRD). $D\alpha$. 8 He recommended dismissal of the Petition because Petitioner has failed to exhaust state review and has not demonstrated that he is excused from the exhaustion requirement. Id. The PFRD was twice returned to the Court as undeliverable. $D\alpha$ s 9& 10 In both cases, the envelope was stamped with the message "No Longer At This Facility." Id.

On September 24, 2012, the Magistrate Judge ordered Petitioner to show cause why the Court should not dismiss this action for failure to update his address as required by D.N.M.LR-Civ. 83.6 $D\alpha$. 11. That order was returned to the Court as undeliverable and, to date, Petitioner has neither updated his address nor otherwise been in contact with the Court. See $d\alpha$. 12.

1

On October 16 2012, the Magistrate Julge issued his second PFRD, recommending dismissal of this action for failure to comply with D.N.M.LR-Civ. 83.6 $D\alpha$. 13. That PFRD was also returned to the Court as undeliverable. $D\alpha$. 14.

Petitioner has not filed objections to either of the Magistrate Julge's PFRDs, and, upon review of the record, I concur with the Magistrate Julge's findings and recommendations. Therefore, I ADO PT both the Magistrate Julge's first and second PFRDs, $d\alpha s 8 \& 13$, and DISM ISS Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, $d\alpha$.

1, without prejudice.

plant gach

ROBERT C. BRACK

UN ITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE